



Boston Brussels Chicago Düsseldorf Frankfurt Houston London Los Angeles Miami
Milan Munich New York Orange County Paris Rome Seoul Silicon Valley Washington, D.C.
Strategic alliance with MWE China Law Offices (Shanghai)

Andrew B. Kratenstein
Attorney at Law
akratenstein@mwe.com
+1 212 547 5695

September 5, 2014

BY ECF

The Honorable Sidney H. Stein
United States District Judge
Daniel Patrick Moynihan
United States Courthouse
500 Pearl Street
New York, NY 10007-1312

Re: *In the Matter of the Petition for the Appointment of an Arbitrator in the Arbitration
Between Hamilton Properties Limited v. FHR Gulf Management FZ LLC and Fairmont
Hotels & Resorts (U.S.) Inc.*, 14 civ. 6507

Dear Judge Stein:

We represent Petitioner Hamilton Properties Ltd. ("Hamilton") in the above-referenced action. I write in response to the second letter submitted earlier today by counsel to Respondents FHR Gulf Management FZ LLC and Fairmont Hotels & Resorts (U.S.) Inc. (together "Fairmont").

We do not wish to belabor the point either, but assuming *arguendo* that the time limits in Local Rule 6.1(b) apply, Fairmont omitted from its letter the key provision of that Rule, which states that "any opposing affidavits and answering memoranda shall be served within *fourteen days* after service of moving papers" Local Rule 6.1(b)(2) (emphasis added).

Again, Fairmont filed a Cross-Petition. Petitioner filed consolidated opposition and reply papers on September 4, 2014, which was fourteen days after Fairmont filed its Cross-Petition and consolidated supporting/opposition papers. To require Hamilton to file a reply in support of its Petition on August 28, 2014, and then a separate opposition to the Cross-Petition a week later on September 4, 2014, would have made absolutely no sense. It simply would have burdened the Court with unnecessary extra filings on the same issues.

Respectfully,

/s/ Andrew B. Kratenstein

Andrew B. Kratenstein